

APPENDIX I  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	Paragraph
Applicability .....	I-1.1.....I-1-1
Multi-year Program .....	I-1.2.....I-1-1
Prioritization .....	I-1.3.....I-1-1
Program Phases.....	I-1.4.....I-1-2
Program Considerations .....	I-1.5.....I-1-3
Submission Requirements .....	I-1.6.....I-1-3

**ILLUSTRATIONS**

	Illustration Page
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program <sub>1</sub> Justification .....	I-1.1.....I-1-4
Program Ceilings.....	I-1.2.....I-1-5
BY and Outyear Programs.....	I-1.3.....I-1-6

APPENDIX I  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)

I-1.1. **Applicability.** This appendix provides program guidance and procedures for all activities in the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) appropriation.

I-1.2. **Multi-year Program.**

a. **Overview and Objectives.** The major objectives of the FUSRAP program are to evaluate and remediate sites identified by the Department of Energy (DOE) as suitable for remediation under FUSRAP. Each FUSRAP division's multi-year program should be developed and conducted in such a manner that projects are completed as soon as possible and at the lowest cost consistent with cleanup criteria that are fully protective of human health and the environment, responsive to regulatory and community interests, and in accordance with land use requirements.

b. **Program Ceilings.** Illustration I-1.2 provides a listing of ceilings for FY 03~~4~~-12. These ceilings reflect the decisions reached March 2001, regarding costs and schedules, as part of the FY 2002 program development process, and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) ceilings, starting in FY 03.

c. **Ceiling Level.** Each FUSRAP division will submit a multi-year program consisting of continuing FUSRAP sites and potential new sites which have been designated as eligible for cleanup under FUSRAP by the Department of Energy. This multiyear program should be consistent with the outyear MSC program ceilings in Illustration I-1.2. For potential new sites, only requirements through FY 0~~5~~4 should be included.

d. **Recommended Level.** Each FUSRAP division will submit a multi-year program consisting of continuing FUSRAP sites and potential new sites which have been designated as eligible for cleanup under FUSRAP by the Department of Energy. This program should reflect funding requirements to achieve the most efficient execution, within the division's capability to accomplish the work, without regard to MSC program ceilings in Illustration I-1.2. For potential new sites, only requirements through FY 0~~5~~4 should be included.

~~de.~~ **Capability Level.** Each FUSRAP Division will submit a multi-year program consisting of continuing FUSRAP and potential new sites which will complete all sites as soon as possible, without regard to efficiency, considering only the division's capability to accomplish the work. For potential new sites, only requirements through FY 0~~5~~4 should be included.

I-1.3. **Prioritization.** Your baseline multiyear program should be developed in accordance with the following priorities:

- demonstrable threat to public health, safety, or the environment;
- potential threat to public health, safety or the environment;
- Federal Facility Agreements (FFA) or other legal/contractual/regulatory requirements;
- completion of response actions;
- efficient design/construction schedule;
- completion of current stage (RI/S, EE/CA, &c);

- local support; and
- potentially responsible party issues.

#### I-1.4. **Program Phases.**

##### a. **Pre-Construction/Implementation.**

(1) **Preliminary Assessment (PA).** A PA is a limited-scope investigation to collect readily available information about a site and its surrounding area. The PA is designed to distinguish, based on limited data, between sites that pose little or no threat to human health and the environment and sites that may pose a threat and require further investigation. The PA also identifies sites requiring assessment for possible emergency response actions.

(2) **Site Inspection (SI).** SI is an on-site inspection to determine whether there is a release or potential release and the nature of the associated threats. The purpose is to augment the data collected in the preliminary assessment and to generate, if necessary, sampling and other field data to determine if further action or investigation is appropriate.

(3) **Remedial Investigation (RI).** RI is the process undertaken to determine the nature and extent of the problem presented by a release which emphasizes data collection and site characterization. The remedial investigation is generally performed concurrently and in an interdependent fashion with the feasibility study.

(4) **Feasibility Study (FS).** FS is a study undertaken to develop and evaluate alternatives for remedial action.

(5) **Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA).** This document is prepared in the case of a non-time critical removal action. The EE/CA is an analysis of removal alternatives and must satisfy environmental review and administrative record requirements, and provide a framework for evaluating and selecting alternative solutions.

(6) **Record of Decision (ROD).** The ROD is a document prepared in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 1505.2 that provides a concise public record of the agency's decision on a proposed action. It identifies alternatives considered in reaching the decision, the environmentally preferable alternative(s), factors balanced by the agency in making the decision, and mitigation measures and monitoring to minimize harm.

(7) **Remedial Design (RD).** RD is an engineering phase that follows the Record of Decision when technical drawings and specifications are developed for subsequent remedial action.

- ##### b. **Remedial Action (RA).** RA is the actual construction and implementation of a remedial design that results in long-term site cleanup.

#### I-1.5. **Program Considerations.**

- ##### a. Alternative Program Year (PY) and outyear requirements should be based on estimated end of PY-2 allocations, and estimated end of PY-1 allocations, constrained to MSC ceiling shown in Illustrations I-1.2 and I-1-3 (updated ceilings are under development and will be provided in separate correspondence). In particular no assumptions should be made regarding additional PY-2<sup>1</sup> work

allowances which might be provided to individual projects in excess of MSC ceilings shown on Illustrations I-1.2 and I-1.3. For potential new sites, only requirements through FY 04~~5~~ should be included.

b. Estimated remaining cost to complete should be based on cost estimates prepared in 1998 as required by CECW-B/CEMP-R memorandum dated 4 Feb 98, subject: Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) Project Baseline Cost Verification, estimates of likely cleanup scenarios in draft feasibility studies/proposed plans, or in accordance with selected alternative from the Record of Decision. Cost estimates, regardless of the basis, shall be updated to October of the program year minus-1 (PY-1) price levels and should not include an allowance for inflation. Project costs will be adjusted at HQUSACE, in accordance with inflation factors provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

**I-1.6. Submission Requirements.**

a. **Justifications.** Supporting data for each site in the FUSRAP Division's program will consist of a Justification Sheet, see Illustration I-1.1. See main body of EC, item 11, Submissions, for presentation specifications.

b. **Alternative PY and Outyear Programs.** Alternative programs, ceiling, recommended and capability, will be submitted as Excel spreadsheets, see Illustration I-1.3. This table is in the process of being updated and will be provided in separate correspondence.

(1) As appropriate, add lines for additional operable units, when there is reasonable evidence that remediation will be required (but identify additional operable unit in such a way that they are distinguishable from each other and the primary effort at the site, e.g. ground water, soil under railroad, building 53 demolition, etc.)

(2) Revise FY 04~~2~~ (BY-2) to match current estimate of final FY 04~~2~~ allocations and revise FY 02~~3~~ (BY-1) to match current estimate of final allocations not to exceed total allocation available to the MSC.

ILLUSTRATION I-1.1  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM  
JUSTIFICATION

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, Fiscal Year 200 <del>3</del> <u>4</u>					Division
STATE					
	Total Estimated Federal Cost \$	Allocation Prior to FY 200 <del>2</del> <u>3</u> \$	Allocation FY 200 <del>2</del> <u>3</u> \$	Tentative Allocation FY 200 <del>3</del> <u>4</u> \$	Additional to Complete After FY 200 <del>3</del> <u>4</u> \$
Site Name	200,000			100,000	100,000
District					

Furnish a brief description of the site, including location, size, ownership, and nature of contamination. Cite any matters known to be of concern to Congress. Describe briefly the general the general scope and key areas of concern that were or are being addressed. Provide any pertinent information concerning coordination with Federal and state agencies, and local communities. Identify Potentially Responsible Parties (PRP), if any, and status of PRP actions. Indicate significant items of work accomplished by the Corps in immediate past and current year. Explain significant changes (increases or decreases) from cost to complete shown on justification sheet for PY-1.

Describe what FY 200~~2~~3 funds will be used for, and what work is scheduled with requested FY 200~~3~~4 funds.

Year when remedial action is scheduled for completion.

ILLUSTRATION I-1.2

**PROGRAM CEILINGS**

(This table will be updated and provided in separate correspondence)

(\$K)

MSC	Fiscal Year											
	PY-2	PY-1	PY	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
LRD	40,661	32,940	45,000	45,000	38,000	40,000	58,000	93,000				
MVD	55,004	52,470	51,000	56,000	54,000	51,000	48,000	44,000				
NAD	44,335	54,590	46,000	44,000	58,000	62,000	52,000	25,000				
<b>Total</b>	140,000	140,000	142,000	145,000	150,000	153,000	158,000	162,000	166,000	170,000	175,000	

EC 11-2-183  
31 Mar 02

ILLUSTRATION I-1.3

**FUNDING**

(This table will be updated and provided in separate correspondence)

\$K

Project	Allocated through FY00	Funding Fiscal Year														Cost to Complete (FY02 to End)	Completion (as of Mar 01)
		Actual 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13 and beyond	Total		
Ashland 1	47,880	6,598	650	0	0	0	0	0						75	55,203	725	FY02
Ashland 2	28,912	0	0	0	0										28,912	0	
Seaway	5,134	1,330	1,420	2,926	13,022	132	92	0	0	284					24,340	17,876	FY05
Linde	52,292	22,799	11,650	17,500	4,700	13,000	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123,941	48,850	FY06
Bliss & Laughlin	1,654	0	0	0	0										1,654	0	
NFSS	18,622	5,105	10,500	10,729	7,391	3,550	476	14,616	74,563	70,672	70,900	2,506	599	4,529	294,758	271,031	FY11
Luckey	11,849	2,600	2,000	11,060	16,500	16,500	16,500	16,500	2,300	200	200	0	0	32,779	128,988	114,539	FY08
Painesville	7,250	340	5,250	500	0	0	0	0	0	0				357	13,697	6,107	FY02
other	3	0	0												3	0	
Dayton 3	80	70	0														
Dayton 4	0	70	0													-70	
Harshaw	40	60	470	385	1,028	1,239	15,750	18,449	121	40	0	0	156	0	37,738	37,638	
Scioto	25	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375	0	
Dayton 1	117	35													152	0	
Dayton Warehouse	117	30													147	0	
Guterl	40	60													100	0	
SLDA	0	185	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,185	1,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>174,015</b>	<b>39,632</b>	<b>32,940</b>	<b>43,100</b>	<b>42,641</b>	<b>34,421</b>	<b>34,818</b>	<b>49,565</b>	<b>76,984</b>	<b>71,196</b>	<b>71,100</b>	<b>2,506</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>37,740</b>	<b>711,413</b>	<b>497,696</b>	
SLAPS	96,092	29,758	26,970	26,237	24,979	23,000	3,000	500	422						230,958	105,108	FY06
SLDS	71,866	17,600	17,500	16,000	16,000	6,000	4,234	500	200						149,900	60,434	FY06
HISS/Latty	44,362	14,000	6,000	5,000	10,000	16,056	17,040	20,412	7,030	500					140,400	82,038	FY08
SLAPS VPs	33,029	2,600	2,000	2,500	1,500	4,000	20,500	20,035	29,000	6,736	0				121,900	86,271	FY09
Madison	2,204	0													2,204	0	
IAAP	40	75													115	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>247,593</b>	<b>64,033</b>	<b>52,470</b>	<b>49,737</b>	<b>52,479</b>	<b>49,056</b>	<b>44,774</b>	<b>41,447</b>	<b>36,652</b>	<b>7,236</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>645,477</b>	<b>333,851</b>	
CE	5,807	500	1,240	600	3,100	3,000	7,000	12,000	5,000	200					38,447	32,140	FY08
Shpack	3,063	900	1,815	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0					6,778	2,815	FY03
Ventron	25	0													25	0	
Colonie	110,462	8,035	13,330	10,000	2,249	1,500	1,500	500	500	0					148,076	29,579	FY06
Maywood	161,955	13,000	27,170	28,000	25,000	24,961	25,735	25,587	14,260	500	500	500			347,868	172,213	FY08
Wayne	100,672	8,000	500	200	200	200	200	128	0	0					114,600	5,928	FY02
Middlesex	70,733	2,000	800	2,140	2,295	9,765	4,072	250	200	0					92,255	19,522	FY06
Dupont	3,705	1,000	1,000	1,400	7,748	2,805	500	500	0	0					18,658	13,953	FY05
WR Grace	5,597	2,900	4,235	1,150	250	10,500	15,500	5,500	500	500	0				46,632	38,135	FY07
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>462,019</b>	<b>36,335</b>	<b>54,590</b>	<b>44,490</b>	<b>40,842</b>	<b>52,731</b>	<b>54,507</b>	<b>44,465</b>	<b>20,460</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>813,339</b>	<b>314,285</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>883,627</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>137,327</b>	<b>135,962</b>	<b>136,208</b>	<b>134,099</b>	<b>135,477</b>	<b>134,096</b>	<b>79,632</b>	<b>71,600</b>	<b>3,006</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>37,740</b>	<b>2,170,229</b>	<b>1,145,902</b>	
<b>Cap</b> (adjusted down for inflation)		140,000	140,000	137,597	136,147	136,475	134,888	134,977	134,102	133,153	132,133	131,802	131,364	130,826			